

Comment on the Department of Energy's Yucca Mountain Draft Environmental Impact Statement

I agree with the following statements which I have checked:



RECEIVED

JAN 31 2000

- 1 ☒ The No Action Alternatives are not reasonable. The EIS should have a reasonable no action alternative.
- 2 ☒ The EIS is inadequate because it uses outdated 1990 census data rather than current population data for Nevada.
- 3 ☒ The analysis of transportation impacts in Nevada is insufficient for making modal, corridor and route decisions.
- 4 ☒ The floodplain analysis is insufficient for corridor and route selection
- 5 ☒ The impact of stigma on tourism, recreation and agriculture based economies in Nevada should be analyzed.
- 6 ☒ The EIS should analyze the impacts of a crash between a military airplane and a nuclear waste rail car.
- ☐ Other _____

Comments:

The Department of Energy's Yucca Mountain Draft Environmental Impact Statement includes an option to construct a rail line from Beowawe to Yucca Mountain through Crescent Valley to transport nuclear waste to Yucca Mountain. DOE is required to consider all comments submitted regarding the impacts of building and operating a repository including transportation.

My comments for the record are:

- 7 Hundreds of thousands of dollars have been spent by
the Federal Government to determine if Yucca Mt.
is suitable for a nuclear waste repository. Now, after
spending so much money, they are changing the guidelines.
8 I believe that this money could have been
spent in a better way by doing studies to
determine how nuclear wastes could be treated
at the sites where they occur instead of transporting
the high level radioactive waste through Nevada
to Yucca Mt.
9 I am not in favor of having Yucca
Mt. or any place in Nevada used as a
nuclear waste repository.